Radical Abolitionist.

"PROCLAIM LIBERTY THROUGHOUT *ALL* THE LAND, UNTO *ALL* THE INHABITANTS THEREOF."—LEV. XXV. 10.

VOLUME I.] NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1855. [NUMBER 4.

The Radical Abolitionist.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

Is Published Monthly,

AT 48 BEEKMAN STREET, NEW YORK.

BY THE CENTRAL ABOLITION COMMITTEE.

Terms.

(PER ANNUM, OR FOR TWELVE NUMBERS.)

SINGLE COPIES	$0.50
FIVE COPIES directed to one person	2.00
EIGHT COPIES, do. do.	3.00
FOURTEEN COPIES, do. do.	5.00
THIRTY COPIES, do. do.	10.00

Payments in advance.

☞ All letters must be post-paid.

☞ Small change, or sums less than one dollar, may be sent in post-office stamps; or, if stamps cannot be procured, one dollar may be sent, and the balance will be sent back in stamps deducting postage.

PROSPECTUS.

The "RADICAL ABOLITIONIST" proposes a proclamation of "liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." It demands of the *American Government* and the *American People*, the immediate and unconditional abolition of *American Slavery*.

It makes this demand on behalf of three millions of Americans *already* enslaved, on behalf of twenty millions more in process of *becoming* enslaved, and in behalf of the untold millions of their posterity, who must be enslaved for ages to come, unless American Slavery be overthrown.

It urges this demand in the name of humanity chattelized, republicanism disgraced, religion dishonored, the Holy Scriptures perverted, the Saviour blasphemed, the laws of nature and of nature's God trampled under foot.

It denies that the Federal Government, under the Federal Constitution, has either a moral or a political right to tolerate slavery, in any of the States belonging to the Federal Union, for a single day.

"The United States SHALL *guarantee* to EVERY State in the Union a republican form of government."—*Constitution.*

"The foundation of republican government is the right of *every* citizen, in his person and property, and in their management."—*Jefferson.*

It denies that "the reserved rights of the States" include any such right as that of holding property in man, as no such "right" can exist; and Mr. Madison tells us that the Federal Convention would not permit the Constitution to recognize any such right.—*Vide Madison Papers*

It affirms that the Constitution unequivocally inhibits the States from maintaining slavery.

"No State shall pass any bill of attainder, or laws impairing the obligation of contracts." And "No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."—*Constitution.*

It affirms that the Constitution was formed by "the people of the United States," (*all* of them,) "to secure the blessings of LIBERTY for (themselves) and (their) posterity," without exception or distinction of race or color. And hence, no portion of "the people of the United States" can be constitutionally enslaved, and the declared *object* of the Constitution *requires* the Federal Government to "secure the blessings of liberty" to each and all of them.

If the Constitution is not available for these purposes, it is of no practical value, it is condemned by its own high professions, and the people have no alternative left them but to provide a better government for their protection, or become the serfs of the petty oligarchy of three hundred thousand slaveholders, who are now suffered to control and insult a great nation.

The 'RADICAL ABOLITIONIST' recognizes as valid law no unrighteous enactments. It affirms, with all the great writers on Common Law, "that statutes against fundamental morality are void;" that "no human laws have any validity if contrary to the law of God, and such of them as are valid derive all their force, mediately, or immediately, from this original.' —FORTESCUE.

On this ground, as well as from the admitted absence of any positive law in this country, establishing slavery; from the known incompetency of the colonial legislatures under British common law, to legalize it; from the ascertained illegality of the African slave trade, by which the colonies were supplied with slaves; and from the unanimous declaration of the thirteen original States, in the very act of establishing their independent governments, that all just governments" are founded on the "inalienable right" of "*all* men" to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," we affirm the absolute illegality of American slavery. We deny that it has any more legality in Georgia than in Massachusetts; that it is any more legal than the African slave-trade, or any other form of piracy and crime.

The object of this paper will be to unfold, explain, vindicate, and propagate these sentiments, calling on the people to maintain them at the ballot-box, thus providing for a federal legislature, a federal judiciary and a federal executive, that shall give them a national expression and force.

LAME LOGIC AND ERRING ETHIS.

Constitutions expounded, irrespective of their "words and sentences"!

Mr. HENRY C. WRIGHT, in the Liberator of Sept. 21, assails the Constitution as being pro-slavery, and gives, as an expression of his views, some Resolutions presented at a Convention at Mesopotamia, (O.,) among which is the following.

"Resolved, That all who swear to support the Constitution of the United States call God to witness that they will submit to and help execute the Will of the Slaveholder as the supreme law of the land."

One would think that so strong an affirmation as this should be backed up by something like strong evidence. The least that could be expected, would be some extract from the Constitution itself, that should warrant the statement.

But no! Mr. Henry C. Wright knew better, it would seem, than to attempt producing any evidence of that kind. Could he have found any thing, in the document, to his purpose, undoubtedly it would have been brought forward. But it was not there. And so, he substitutes in its stead, the following.

"No matter what words and sentences are on that parchment, written there by the Convention of 1787. If every word were LIBERTY, the slaveholders, if in the majority, by the consent of all voters, have a right to make it mean Slavery, in the actuality. They have done so, and will do so. Then, to swear to execute the present Constitution is to swear to be true to the will of the slaveholder."

And so the grave question concerning the character of the Constitution is, at length, settled—and settled, too, without the slightest reference to what the Constitution expresses!—"*No matter what words and sentences*" *it contains.* It is "pro-slavery" any how; and there is the end of the matter! We could hardly have believed our eyes, when we read this, if we had not known to what straits the opponents of the Constitution were driven, and had heard something like it before, in the heat of verbal debate. We should not have dared to predict that any one would ever deliberately take this position, or could consciously entertain such a sentiment. But here it is, in black and white, and in plain terms. Here it is, in the Liberator, and without a word of dissent from Mr. Garrison. Hereafter, Mr. Wendell Phillips and the writer of the American A. S. Society's Tract No. 1, will have no occasion to refer to the provisions of the Constitution for their arguments. The enterprise of proving the Constitution pro-slavery, by that method, appears to have been abandoned as hopeless. A more promising method has been discovered. Hitherto the character of a document has been supposed to depend somewhat upon "the words and sentences" of which it was composed. But those times have gone by. "If every word" of the Constitution "were LIBERTY"—if it were as faultless as Mr. Garrison himself could make it—if it contained every syllable of the Anti-Slavery Declaration of 1833, and if it contained nothing else, it would be pro-slavery still—a "covenant with death and an agreement with hell"—and "all who swear to support it" would "call on God to witness that they will submit to and help execute the Will of the Slaveholder, as the supreme law of the land."

Let us see how this logic will work. If slaveholders should get into the American Anti-Slavery Society—if they should come in sufficient numbers to outvote and oust Mr. Garrison and the other officers of the Society, (or if a majority of the original members should do this, and apostatize,) and if they should wield its machinery for their pro-slavery purposes, then the Anti-Slavery Declaration of 1833 and the Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society then adopted, would be pro-slavery. And "all who promise to support" *that* "Constitution," would "call God to witness that they will submit to and help execute the Will of the slaveholder," and his confederates!

Should it be said that the cases are not parallel because the Constitution of 1833 expressly excludes slaveholders, we answer—in the words of Henry C. Wright—"No matter what words and sentences are written on that parchment, written there by the Convention of" 1833.

The doctrine of Henry C. Wright is, that the character of the Constitution is to be ascertained and determined by the character of the officials who get possession of it and wield it. The

same doctrine, in different language, was uttered, we think, by C. C. Burleigh, during our debate with him, at the Anniversary, last May. It figures, likewise, as *one* of the links of the argument, in the American Anti-Slavery Society's Tract, No. 1.—And we have met with forms of it, elsewhere. The improved form, employed by Mr. Wright, consists in the frankness with which he *declares* what the others had only *implied*, that it is "no matter what words and sentences are on that parchment." If the Constitution of 1787 *had* excluded slaveholders, in so many words, the principle of Mr. Wright, as well as his words, would have condemned the Constitution, still, because slaveholders have administered the government. He would say, "They have done so, and will do so. Then, to swear to execute the present Constitution, is to swear to be true to the will of the slaveholder."

By the same logic, if the Decalogue should fall into the hands of ecclesiastics and expositors who should construe it to sanction, in detail, every one of the sins it prohibits, and, if with this false statement of its character, they should employ its authority to promote the commission of those sins, then the character of the Decalogue, ("no matter what words and sentences are on that parchment,") would be as vile as the practices thus instigated!

By the same logic, the Bible might be proved pro-slavery because it has been construed in favor of slavery, and used for the support of it. And to this service that same logic has already been applied by some of the same persons who use it against the Constitution.

But, what deserves the notice of the citizen, the statesman, and the jurist, is, the coolness with which this argument assumes that violations of Constitutions, are, of course, constitutional, and give character to the Constitutions they violate!—that those who swear to support Constitutions that have been violated "call God to witness that they will submit to, and help execute the will of [the violators] as the supreme law of the land"—or, in other words, that violations of law are lawful, and give character to the laws violated, particularly when violated by those who had enacted or assented to them!

By the same logic, the Last Will and Testament, the Deed of Warranty, or the Written Agreement between two citizens—("no matter what words and sentences are on that parchment") that falls into the hands of knaves, and that is perverted for their purposes, becomes *itself*, of the same character with those knaves, —and "all who swear to support" and carry out that instrument, "call God to witness that they will submit to and execute the will of" these knaves!

Mr. Wright challenges admiration for his frankness. And yet we should like to see his fidelity to his principle tested, in a case in which his own title to a fine estate should be suspended on the application of that principle to a Will, a deed, or written agreement! We cannot but try to imagine how he would look, standing up in Court, and saying,

"May it please the Court, and Gentlemen of "the Jury. It is indeed true that I am the right-"ful owner of this estate, so far as justice and "equity are concerned. I paid the full price "of it to the persons who signed the Warranty "Deed, an attested copy of which I hold in my "hand. My lawyers tell me that their title to "the estate they sold me was undoubted, and "that their Deed of it to me is correctly drawn. "Of this I have no doubt, nor is it longer a "disputed point. And furthermore, I entrust-"ed my property to their keeping, on a written "agreement which was properly written, an at-"tested copy of which I also hold in my hand. "But since the original documents and the es-"tate have always remained in their hands—"since they have always mismanaged my es-"tate, defrauded me of the products, violated "their agreement, and now claim the estate as "their own, I have come to the conclusion—in "accordance with my habit of expounding the "Constitution of the United States, that your "Honorable Court, and you, Gentlemen of the "Jury, who have taken an oath to administer "and execute truly these two documents, have, "by that act, 'called God to witness that you "will submit to, and carry out the will of these "rascals, as being, in reality, the law of the "land'—'no matter what words and sentences "are on those parchments.'"

Would Mr. Henry C. Wright dispose of such a case, in that manner? *Would he?*—When he does, it will be in time for him, as a professed advocate of the slave, before the High inquest of the Nation, to manage the slave's case in this manner.

Let him show that the cases are not essentially parallel, if he can. We think we have anticipated and cut off his only loop-hole of retreat. He will perhaps place the fault of the Constitution in its provision or implication that the majority, even if they are slaveholders, shall rule. And he will say that, in that case, the minority are bound to "submit to and execute the will of" the majority. We are not unapprized of this unfounded objection to democratic institutions, or, more properly, to Civil Government, in all its forms.

We might here cut short all Mr. Wright's criticisms of the *Constitution* by his own fundamental axiom—"No matter what words and sentences are on the parchment, written there by the Convention of 1787." If every word had been a denial of the duty of the minority to "submit to and execute the will of the" majority, it would have made no manner of difference with Mr. Henry C. Wright. His principle helps him to his conclusions, without looking into "the parchment" at all.

Waiving all this, our supposition of Mr. Wright's law case, is sufficiently parallel to the case of the Constitution and the slave. We have supposed Mr. Wright to have committed his estate and his documents into the keeping of unfaithful men. And the nation that adopted the Federal Constitution can have done nothing more.

But it is not true that a Constitution, of Government in general, or that our own Constitution, in particular, requires or implies a promise, on the part of minorities, to "submit to and execute the will of" the majority, when the majority violate the Constitution and defeat its declared objects! The supposition is ludicrously absurd, on the face of it. Precisely the opposite of this, is the known fact. Constitutions, particularly in democracies, are designed chiefly and are contrived mainly with a view to *limiting* the powers of the Government, in other words, of majorities—to prescribe (1) what they *shall* do—(2) what they *may* do, and (3) what they shall *not* and may not do. All this is a flat denial of the doctrine that when majorities violate the Constitution, minorities "are bound by the Constitution to submit to the will of" the majority. The oath to support the Constitution is an oath to *oppose* violations of the Constitution, instead of being, (as Mr. Wright would have it) an oath "to submit to, and help execute them"! Who can fail to perceive this?

The perversion of the Constitution—so often quoted by its opposers, in this connection (but which Mr. Wright's "*no-matter*" mode of exposition excludes *him* from quoting) namely, that the Supreme Court shall determine all mooted Constitutional questions, avails nothing, here. This provision, rightly understood, does not sanction the absurdity that "minorities are to submit to and to help execute" violations of the Constitution they have sworn to support—and that, too, *because* they have thus sworn! Our fathers were not such fools as to say *that!* All men know that in every judiciary, however the Courts may be constituted, there must be a last or final Court of Appeal. In the United States, this is the Supreme Court. Having decided a particular case, there is no higher Court to which that case can be carried. The objection to this, is an objection to having any civil government at all.

But what then? In the very next case that presents itself, the way is as open as ever, for obtaining a counter decision. Nothing is more common than counter decisions, by the same Court—sometimes without a change of Judges, (as in the case of Somerset) and sometimes by placing better Judges on the bench. The oath to support a righteous Constitution, so far from being an oath to support either legislative or judicial violations of it, is an oath to do all that lawfully can be done, at the ballot box and in the Court room, to secure a faithful administration of the Constitution, by the repeal of all unconstitutional legislation, and by the reversal of all unconstitutional decisions. Here is work enough for the true and wise friends of the slave, without the reckless trampling of Constitutions under foot, to the tune of—"No matter what words and sentences are on that parchment"! Until men are prepared to surrender in this manner, the rights of property they hold under Wills, Deeds, Bonds, and other written Agreements, let them not thus surrender the right to liberty, secured by "the words and sentences on that parchment" to three or four millions of slaves!

"They have done so—and they will do so," Mr. Wright may say. But why and how have they done so, but because they have expounded the Constitution as *he* expounds it? and by holding the servile position which *his* mode of expounding Constitutional oaths and obligations tends to encourage?

"DENATIONALIZING OF SLAVERY."

The following letter will be read with interest and profit. It comes from a gentleman well known to many of our readers. In sentiment, it is a specimen of many letters that are reach-

ing us from members of the Free Soil or Republican party. We only wonder what good reason they can find for continuing to cast their influence in favor of that movement.

PINE GROVE, Gallia Co. O. Aug. 15, '55.

Bro. Goodell—A package of the first number of the Radical Abolitionist reached this office last week. I hail its appearance with pleasure, and hope that it may be sustained, and that its principles may yet prevail. I was very desirous to have been at the Syracuse Convention, but could not.

Though I have acted, as far as I have taken part in politics, with the Free Soil party from its first organization, and shall still act with it this fall, or rather with the Republican movement, yet still I have for several years been satisfied that the ground taken by the Free Soil party, was *too low*—that it was, to a certain and important degree, a compromise with Slavery. And if this was true of the Free Soil party, what shall we say of the more recent Republican movement, with its *single-plank* platform, and that exceedingly narrow.

I confess that I do not see the signs of hope and final triumph, in this Republican movement, that some others see. The basis principle that underlies the whole movement is not the *wrongfulness of Slavery*, but *retaliation upon the South* for an outrage of plighted faith. I have listened to a good many Republican orators, and, with the exception of those who belonged to the old anti-slavery column, their speeches have breathed but one spirit—"let us be revenged." Now if the South should consent to restore the Missouri Compromise, and not insist, for the present, upon the acquisition of any more territory or the admission of any more Slave States, all of which she could do with infinitely less peril than to dissolve the Union, what would the Republican party have to contend for? And yet what real gain would all this be to the cause of freedom? What important step toward the extinction of slavery?

I will not say that *nothing* would be accomplished for the cause of freedom in the triumph of the present Republican movement of the North, but certainly very little would be accomplished for the liberation of the slave. Suppose we get no more slave territory—no more slave States, and get the restriction of the Missouri Compromise restored, what then? You have conceded to the Slave Power the right to live and fatten as it can within its present limits, and within that limit it *can* fatten upon the sweat and blood of oppression for a century to come.

Besides, admit the rightfulness, or, if you please, the *constitutionality* of slavery within its present limits, and all the talk about denationalizing slavery is mere *flummery*. If slavery within its present limits is constitutional, the general government is constitutionally bound, in cases of insurrection in which the State powers were incompetent to restore order, to interpose the national power for that purpose. If this be not true, slavery must be a *very peculiar* institution, for I know of no other constitutional right guaranteed to an individual or State, which the government is not bound to protect him in if necessary. What then becomes of "denationalization?"

Again: if slavery is constitutional, I see not why the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850, stripped of a few grosser passages, would not be perfectly proper, so far as the constitutional obligation is concerned. Certainly to concede the constitutionality of slavery is to concede that Congress has the right to legislate for the rendition of fugitive slaves, where State authority has failed to secure such rendition. And I see not why the general government may not demand of Great Britain, in behalf of her Southern citizens, all the fugitive slaves that have found an asylum upon her soil.(1)

But some one will say, "The Constitution recognises slavery, but as a *local* institution."—Indeed! that must be a clause of the Constitution I have entirely overlooked—nay, I have never been so fortunate as to get my hands upon a copy containing that clause. When we ask for the constitutional guarantees of slavery, we are pointed to the "three-fifths of all other persons," to the migration and importation clause, and to the rendition clause. Is there any thing in these that recognises slavery as a local institution merely? I confess if slavery is recognised as a constitutional right at all, I do not see but it is recognised just as any other right, and is to be so protected.(2)

It may be said that Congress could not create slavery, but might recognise the right of the individual States to do so by State enactment. Very well; Congress could not *create* the property right in a horse, simply because it existed before there was a Congress. But when Congress *admitted* the right of property in a horse, it pledged the whole power of the general government to defend that right, when it became necessary, and to use all the resources of government necessary to secure the undisturbed possession of that right. It does seem to me that, under our form of government, the very recognition of a right by the general government, involves by necessity the idea of protection in that right, to the full extent of the resources and powers of the government, when necessary. What then becomes of "denationalization?"

I am therefore driven to this conclusion: Slavery will never be denationalized, till it is outlawed and driven from the covert of the Constitution and the sacred precincts of the Bible and the Christian Church.

Yours fraternally,

W. G. KEPHART.

REMARKS.

(1) Our correspondent has here touched upon one of the causes which must forever *prevent* the leaders of the movement he describes from attaining even their own low objects. The extension of slavery cannot be prevented by those who concede the constitutional right of slaveholding.

(2) True. And this remark might be applied to all the old States, as well as the Territories. The suit of Virginia versus New York, and the decision of Judge Kane, cover the entire ground, and affirm the duty of the Federal Government to protect slavery in all the States, in despite of State Legislation.

FROM A FREE-SOIL EDITOR.

WM. GOODELL—Dear Sir: I am about to correspond with you upon a subject which I know you consider of the greatest importance, and my own interest in the cause must serve as my apology for addressing one I never saw; but to whose writings I have given much time and serious attention.

I have been the editor of a political paper for the twelve years last past, and about three years of that time I have devoted to the anti-slavery cause, in connection with the Free Soil Non-Extension party. I have, during the latter period, given the subject of slavery much consideration, the result of which has been that I feel myself in duty bound to attach myself to the "Radical Abolition" party of the country. I started out in the cause in good faith—believing that the most effectual way to rid our country of the evils of slavery, was, to prevent its further extension; but a more minute and thorough investigation of the subject—upon reading your "American Slave Code," "Slavery and Anti-Slavery," "Legal Tenures of Slavery," the Speech of Hon. Gerrit Smith, delivered in the Congress of the United States on the Nebraska-Kansas Bill, and the miscellaneous writings of the Hon. Wm. Jay*—has fully convinced me that the *only* reasonable way to get rid of American slavery, is by striking at the root of the evil. I am thoroughly convinced, that the Constitution of the United States is an anti-slavery document, both in letter and spirit; and that while we merely oppose the extension of slavery, we are, impliedly, at least, admitting it to be religiously, morally, socially and politically right where it now exists; which doctrine I now most emphatically repudiate. If slavery is right where it now exists, it is clear to my mind, that it would not only be right in us, but an absolute duty to extend it into every State and Territory of the Union. If slavery is right in principle it should be made universal, if wrong it should be abolished everywhere. If it would be wrong to extend slavery—which I presume nineteen-twentieths of the people of the Free States will cheerfully admit—to introduce slavery into Ohio or any other Free State of this Union, it is equally as wrong, in my opinion, for the people of the Free States to sanction its existence in the States where it now exists. The principle upon which the whole superstructure of American slavery is founded, is wrong, and a direct violation of all revealed, moral, and natural laws, and should be abandoned at once. There can be no such thing as property in man! It is a violation of every principle of equality and right; and so long as men acknowledge its legality any where, just so long they will violate every principle of right.

Entertaining this view of the whole subject, I cannot longer operate with a party which I believe is doing nothing towards the accomplishment of the desired end. The truth is, it is without an aim; as the only plausible way to rid the country of slavery, is to abolish it where it now exists; and this the Fusion, Free Soil, Non-Extension party, does not contemplate doing.

---

* Though Judge Jay has not adopted the views of the Constitution which we advocate, yet his writings do show that the evil cannot be reached under any other construction of the Constitution.—ED.

I have carefully read your Syracuse resolutions, and they receive my most cordial approval. They lay a foundation broad enough and strong enough to support the great anti-slavery, Abolition sentiment now so rapidly growing up in the minds of the people of the Free States; and it is the only platform that is comprehensive enough to accomplish the great end in view—the abolition of American slavery. We may talk and write as much as we please about "no more Slave States," but experience teaches me that nothing can be accomplished in that way. The history of the past teaches me, that to rid ourselves of the evil, we must strike a death-blow at the system itself. There has been more done within the six years last past, to extend and perpetuate the system, than was done in the ten years preceding, and that too, when the non-extension doctrine was the most urgently pressed upon the minds of the people.

Radical Abolitionist.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER, 1855.

☞ TAKE NOTICE, *that we do not make any charges for papers sent to those who have not ordered or subscribed for them.*

RESPONSE FROM MICHIGAN.

WHITEFORD, Aug. 15, '55.

DEAR SIR—I have been very much gratified and edified in perusing the details of the Convention of Radical Abolitionists at Syracuse, and the adoption of the new and very appropriate cognomen—"Radical Abolitionist"—as the caption for your valuable abolition sheet.

There is a strong abolition sentiment in our community, (Whiteford and Bedford, Monroe county,) and the Radical Abolitionist has quite a number of subscribers in our vicinity. We have recently organized a Society upon the principles of the Syracuse Convention. The Preamble and Resolutions of the Society I subjoin, which, could you afford the space, I would be pleased if you would publish. The Constitution, on account of its length, I omit.

"Whereas, The design of all Governments is to secure to man his rights, and whereas, to attain this object, and to extend to their posterity the benefits of civil and religious liberty, our Revolutionary Fathers fought and bled and died; and whereas, Slavery is the antagonist of Freedom, and whereas the design of legislation is to extend freedom and not slavery; and whereas, the undersigned, believing slavery to be a great evil, mainly because of the wrong done to the slave; also affecting, to a greater or less degree, all the valid interests of the country—the moral, political, educational, social, agricultural, commercial, postal, and all other means of general intelligence; also all the departments of internal improvement; also our diplomacy and intercourse with foreign nations: and whereas all efforts at non-extension have, and in our judgment, must forever prove abortive: therefore,

1st. Resolved, That we are in favor of striking at the "root of the evil," and that we insist upon the immediate and unconditional abolition, by the Government, of slavery throughout the nation—and to this end we pledge ourselves to vote only for known and tried friends of Freedom, whose position upon the slave question is neither ambiguous nor equivocal.

2d. Resolved, That we recognise as the great and fundamental principle of all right action, that admirable precept of our Lord, "whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them," and that we will labor to secure its practical exemplification in the administration of our National and State Governments—and that slavery being a sin against God and a crime against man, it is the business of the Government at once to suppress it—and that we insist upon the immediate exercise of its prerogative in the suppression of this and every other crime, of every grade and stripe.

3d. Resolved, That all Governments are bound to protect their citizens in the enjoyment of personal liberty—that this question admits of no compromise or evasion—that a Government which is not available for this purpose is unworthy of the name, and ought immediately to be revolutionized, despite of compacts, compromises, or constitutions. (Constitutions must conform to the wants of the people, and not the people to the Constitutions.)

4th. Resolved, That the better to carry out the foregoing principles, we form ourselves into an Association, to be styled "The Association of Radical Abolitionists of the Townships of Whiteford and Bedford, County of Monroe, and State of Michigan," and, as a specification of its powers and duties, we adopt the following Constitution.

The Constitution, on account of its length, we omit.

Respectfully yours,
J. C. WHITE,
Sec. of the Association.

FROM ELD. SAMUEL AARON.

NORRISTOWN, Pa. Aug. 10, '55.

WM. GOODELL,—Dear Friend and Brother—I have long regarded your views, facts and arguments in reference to slavery, irrefutable and unanswerable; though I have acted in the peculiar circumstances which surround me, with organizations less clear and far less radical than that which your writings represent. But this morning and this moment I have been reading your "Radical Abolitionist" No. 1, and it has so wrought upon me that I feel, God helping, determined to uphold hereafter more openly and more boldly, the *thorough-going principles* which you and Gerrit Smith, and a few other God-fearing men have so resolutely maintained, and myself and many others have too timidly believed.

The hard struggle which I have always had to procure an honorable livelihood disables me from helping you much in the way of money, but my prayers and testimonies hereafter shall not be wanting: and I trust in God that the time is drawing near, when manifestations visible, tangible and irresistible, shall aid and substantiate the efforts you have long been making with much patience and through many trials.—Truth and rectitude and the approbation of God are sublime arguments and incentives to perseverance, but it is pleasant to the soul to see, like Simeon, the promised "salvation" born.

The fierce malignity and unremitting persecution on the part of our Federal, Executive, and Judicial Magistracy, against all true and active lovers of liberty, remind me of the furious zeal of Herod to destroy the *Innocent*, and indicate that "Satan has come down in great wrath, knowing that his time is short." The people surely are beginning to learn what you have always told them, that slavery dooms every thing to destruction which stands between it and absolute power. This is well, and we shall now see whether government was made for man, or man for government. A revolution is certainly budding which will reduce Law into practical Justice, and time-honored stupidities into common sense, or else rivet the fetters of a darker despotism on the human soul than that which built the Pyramids or inspired the Crusades. If Americans, men who can read, can much longer grovel before the Oligarchy of one-twentieth of their number, whose insignia of power and glory are bloodhounds, handcuffs and cowhides, then shall it be demonstrated that MAN is indeed a THING, not competent to know God and love him, but having muscles, given only for brute toil, and nerves to feel the cartwhip. I do not mean this for blasphemy, for I fear the Lord.

I have run on rather because I could not help it, than because I designed it—and now close with stating that I transmit, though very scarce of money, five dollars in aid of our cause, requesting that you will send me two copies of the Abolitionist, and the pamphlet it refers to, and that you will apprise me when you need money, for I will help if I can.

Your friend and brother in the truth,
SAMUEL AARON.

P. S. Thanks to you and Gerrit Smith for remembering me with good documents, when I had *seemed* to forget you.

EXTRACT OF A LETTER FROM DR. HORTON.

TERRYTOWN, Pa., Sept. 15, '55.

"Strange that good men, and men of sense, will run after shadows!—that men will try to act against slavery and yet lack moral courage to say that they are abolitionists—that they will talk about freeing the government from all responsibility for slavery, and yet say that they have no power to touch slavery in the States. Strange that men cannot see that the instant they give slavery a resting place in the States, they make it "national," and make their efforts to free the government from it worse than nonsensical. The cry that slavery is sectional and liberty national in our country, is the most unmeaning thing that ever proceeded from the lips of great or good men. If men cannot see that conceding the right of the slave master to hold his slave in Virginia under the Federal compact, or to recover escapes from slavery under the same compact, makes slavery national, they certainly are not yet fully recovered from the pro-slavery opthalmy which has so long obscured the vision of this nation. If Gov. Chase, Senator Hale, and the rest of the *elite* in what are considered the hosts of freedom, can find a constitutional recognition of slavery in South Carolina, they will also find it in Ohio, in New Hampshire, in Kansas—and it will not be long before the proud southron will verify his boast of calling his slave-roll under the shadow of Bunker Hill monument."

G. F. HORTON.

"THAT GUN KICKS."—There will be found, commencing on our first page, an exposure of the "*lame logic and erring ethics*" of Mr. Henry C. Wright, in his assumption that the Constitution—"no matter what words and sentences are on that parchment"—is necessarily of the same character with its administrators, however grossly they may violate it, so that those who swear to support it, "call God to witness that they will submit to, and help execute the will of" those said administrators, whatever that will may be!

We need add nothing further in illustration of the absurdity of that assumption. But, on reading over the proof-sheet, after the printer had "made up" those pages, it occurred to us that there is still another use to make of Mr. Wright's doctrine.

Suppose we should admit, for the argument's sake, that Mr. Wright's method of Constitutional exposition is the correct one? What follows? What is the use that an earnest abolitionist, like Henry C. Wright, should make of the discovery of that doctrine?

Why! Very evidently, it is this. The non-slaveholders are the vast majority of the people, who hold the Constitution in their hands, and who control it by their votes. Even the people of the non-slaveholding States are a large majority, and, notwithstanding the inequalities of representation—so loudly and so justly complained of—they can control the National Government, as they please. The Constitution—"no matter what words and sentences are on that parchment"—is precisely what that majority of non-slaveholders are pleased to make it, by their administration of it.

So, at least, Mr. Henry C. Wright believes. *That*, in his view, is the fair and honest method of expounding the Constitution. For, so rigid a moral reformer as Henry C. Wright, assuredly, would never have prostituted his talents to the advocacy of a method of exposition, which he deemed an unsound, a dishonest, or a dishonorable one, especially when he thought it to work in favor of slavery.

How rejoiced will he be, as an enemy of slavery, to have discovered so potent a weapon for its destruction! As a friend of the slave, how eagerly will he hasten to employ this machinery for his release! If he advocated this method of exposition, even when he supposed it to work only against the slave, how much more zealously will he advocate it, when he opens his eyes (as he soon must) to the fact that it can be quite as efficiently employed for the slave's liberation! All he has to do is to persuade the people *to make* the Constitution anti-slavery. He need not take the trouble to show that it is already so, by its "words and sentences," as *we* are obliged to do. He will "outface" us on our own ground—get away all our thunder, and take all the wind out of our sails! Go a-head, we say, Henry C. Wright, if *that* is your application of your rules of Constitutional exposition, and success to you. But, in the name of all that is decent, do not, so long as you are an abolitionist, promulgate, as a rule of exposition, the doctrine that the Constitution is whatever the will of the majority make it, irrespective of its "words and sentences,"—and then claim for the petty minority of 350,000 slaveholders the exclusive monopoly of that rule of construction.

Seriously. We call, not only on Henry C. Wright, but also on Charles C. Burleigh, who, substantially, insists on the same rule of exposition—we call upon Wendell Phillips, Edmund Quincy, and William Lloyd Garrison, (who all listen to this logic and give it currency, without expressing any dissent from it,) to do one of two things. Either repudiate and explode Henry C. Wright's rule of Constitutional exposition, as unsound, and untenable, or else call on the people to inaugurate, at the ballot box, an administration that will MAKE the Constitution an anti-slavery one, and with it, break the fetters of the slave.

And, remember! No plea of conscientious scruples, as to the alleged pro-slavery character of the Constitution can excuse you, if you hold that the character of the Constitution is to be determined by the character and action of the administrators. "No matter what words and sentences are on that parchment." The people, yourselves included, are the administrators, and if the character of the Constitution is defective, the fault rests, ultimately, upon the voters; and the remedy for a bad Constitution lies in the ballot box, by which it can be transformed, at pleasure, into a good one. So far from taking the responsibility from off the shoulders of the people, or your own shoulders, this doctrine places and keeps it there—at least until you have done your duty towards getting the Constitution purified. And mark! you have no occasion nor warrant for looking after "the words and sentences on that parchment," or saying a word about them!

SOUTHERN CLAIMS AND NORTHERN CONCESSIONS.

Hon. Richard Broadhead, U. S. Senator, from Pennsylvania, in a recent speech at Easton, in that State, said—

"Now you will all agree to one proposition: Are not all the States of this Union coequal, and are they not equal partners? Undoubtedly. Then comes the great question of power in the Territories. The Northern people claim the right to go into the Territories with their property. The Southern people claim the same right. Now will you accord it to them? I say *the Constitution gives those who own property in the Southern States the same power which we have.* I would not deny a man the same right that I ask for myself. I claim the right to go into the Territories with my property, and I accord to any man from any other State the same right."

Our readers will understand this. The N. Y. Tribune, from which we take this extract, very correctly describes the position of Senator Broadhead, as follows—

"He holds that any single immigrant into Kansas from a slave State may take his slaves with him, and hold them in the Territory as slaves, in defiance of any act or inhibition which the residue of the settlers may have adopted. All other settlers may be conscientiously and determinedly hostile to Slavery; but this one slaveholder steps in with his black servitors and overrules them. 'Popular Sovereignty' condemns slavery; but one slaveholder weighs down thousands of freemen, and decides that Kansas shall be Slave Territory. For that slaveholder, says Mr. Brodhead, has an indefeasible constitutional right to migrate to Kansas, to take his slaves with him, and hold them there in bondage interminably—because they are his property, and he has a right to take his property, and have it respected and secured to him as property, in any Territory of the Union.

"We propose at this time merely to state this doctrine, not to refute it.

"If Mr. Broadhead is right, then all the remaining territory of the Union is destined to form new Slave States, and nothing can prevent that consummation."

Exactly so, Mr. Tribune. That is the doctrine; and that is the practice. And on the heels of this comes Judge Kane's decision, and the anticipated decision of the suit of Virginia vs. New York, taking one "stride" further and declaring that every slaveholder can carry his "property" into any State, and be protected there, by the same authority that protects him in the Territories.

All this is alarming enough, to be sure; and doubly annoying to "practical" politicians (self-styled) as it proves the uselessness of all their temporizing expedients, and verifies the predictions of the "radicals" and "impracticables" who have always insisted that the progress apparently made by mere "non-extensionists" must turn out in the long run, to be a progression backwards, as the event now proves.

The prospect is dreary enough, to be sure. But is it therefore, hopeless? Is there not something to be done about it? And if so, what? Must not the first step be a refutation of the doctrine of Mr. Broadhead? The Tribune only states the doctrine, but "does not propose, at this time, to refute it." It will probably require some time and skill to refute it, without coming on the ground of "radical abolitionists"—denying the constitutional right of property in slaves, altogether, and demanding a national repudiation of the claim, whether in the Territories or the States.

Wherein lies the error of Mr. Broadhead? Let us analyze his paragraph, and see.

1. "Are not all the States of the Union coequal, and are they not equal partners?" Undoubtedly they are. Not one can dispute that, Mr. Broadhead.—But what then?

2. "I claim," says Mr. B., "the right to go into the Territories with my property, and I accord to any other man from any other State, the same right."—Perfectly correct, again, Mr. B.—No reasonable man can say any thing against that. And what next?

3. "I say the Constitution gives those who own property in the Southern States, the same power which we have." We say so, too, as every man, in his own conscience, must say. But what has all this to do with the controversy going on in the Territories?

Mr. Broadhead undoubtedly thinks he has proved the right of the people of the Southern States to bring *slaves* into the Territories, and hold them there, as slaves.

By no means, Mr. Broadhead. You have proved no such thing.

"But why not?" demands Mr. B.

Simply, Sir, because human beings *are not property*, and never can be. The Constitution recognizes no such rights of property, but forbids the practice of slaveholding, in the States as well as in the Territories.

Thus we "refute the doctrine" of Mr. Broadhead, and we demand whether there is

any other way of refuting it? We demand, and we have a right—the country has a right to demand of such journals as the New York Tribune, the Portland Inquirer, the National Era, &c., what possible refutation they can make, of the doctrine of Mr. B., so long as they recognize the constitutional right of slave property or of slaveholding, in any one of the States? THEY CANNOT DO IT. We challenge them to make the attempt. And we challenge such strong statesmen as Chase, Giddings, Wade, Hale, and their associates, to refute the doctrine of Mr. Broadhead, if they can, without taking the "radical" ground that slavery is unconstitutional every where, and is to be tolerated no where.

It cannot be done. And until this ground is taken by the North, and by the strong men of the North, its editors, senators and leading men, the aggressive march of slavery will be onward and northward, and "nothing can prevent that consummation."

"If Mr. Broadhead is right," says the Tribune, "all the remaining territory of the Union is destined to form new Slave States." To be sure they are, and all the non-slaveholding States are to become slave States, in defiance of all the empty parade and the idle swaggering, the "fusion" and the *con*fusion of all those who still shut their eyes to the plain fact that slavery is as unconstitutional and illegal in *every* part of the country as it is in *any* part of the country—that it must be *suppressed* every where, or *protected* every where.

It may be very easy—as the Tribune finds it easy—to show that "the whole doctrine of squatter sovereignty is pitched overboard" by Mr. Broadhead. Of course it is, as its original propagators intended it should be, when its work of deception was accomplished. On *this* question, the logic of the Tribune does not falter. It has no occasion to defer the task of refutation. It strikes us, by the bye, that the Tribune's annihilating queries in that direction need but little revision, to enlist them in another service. Let us see.

"Who *are* the 'people' of Kansas or Nebraska, who have the right to determine that certain of their fellow-inhabitants shall be doomed to eternal bondage? Are they the *whole* people, or only the whites? Are they the citizens of the United States? Or are they resident emigrants from Europe also entitled to a voice in deciding this momentous question, so vitally affecting them as well as others? And, however these questions may be answered, what is the state of the law respecting slavery prior to any decisive action of the people on the subject? Let these questions be frankly answered and then we shall know what is meant by Popular Sovereignty in the Territories."

And pray who *are* the people of Virginia and Georgia that have that same right of establishing slavery? "Are they the *whole* people, or only the whites? Are they native Americans, or emigrants from Europe, &c.? And what was the state of the law respecting slavery, prior to any decisive action of the people," &c.? "When these" and kindred "questions are frankly answered, we shall know what is meant by the" constitutional right of slaveholding in the States.

When the logic of our prominent statesmen and editors is less one-sided and partial, they will begin to reach safer conclusions.

"CONTROVERSY BETWEEN N. Y. TRIBUNE AND GERRIT SMITH."—In this pamphlet of 32 pages, Mr. Smith republishes his controversy with the New York Tribune, which appeared in that paper, with an *additional* Letter, and some "Extracts from the N. Y. Tribune," which gave rise to the controversy. The Tribune, we think, will hereafter be more careful what it says of Gerrit Smith, and of how it forgets and denies having said it.—New York: printed by J. A. Gray, 97 Cliff street.

WISE ON THE MISSOURI COMPROMISE.

The following extract from a recent letter, written by Henry A. Wise to some political friends in New Orleans, shows what Southern men regard as the "main question:"

The Kansas Nebraska bill repealed the Missouri Compromise, which was the first act to violate Washington's injunction not to recognise geographical lines—which was the first to begin a separation of the States! Now, the Kansas and Nebraska bill simply restores to *statu quo ante* 1819–20, where Washington, Adams, Hancock and Jefferson, Virginia and Massachusetts, and the Old Thirteen stood. The question is, shall it be repealed, and a heart-burning state be restored to the place of the Constitution? Virginia votes no, North Carolina, no, Georgia—glorious Georgia—no; Alabama, no. The entire slaveholding States will, notwithstanding the hesitancy of gallant but blood-stained Kentucky, all unite in shouting, as a host of Freedom, as friends of America—

"African slavery *shall not* be abolished!

"The American Union of States *shall not* be dissolved!"

There let us abide, under the Ægis of the Constitution and the laws. To defend these, I will stake 'life, fortune, and sacred honor,' against internal as well as external foes."

To this, the Anti-Slavery Bugle responds:—

"Such is the wise conclusion of every friend of the perpetuity of Slavery. 'Slavery *shall not* be abolished,—The Union *shall not* be dissolved.' To protect Slavery, the Union is indispensable. The Ægis of the Constitution is their safe defence."

We beg leave to dissent from the conclusion which we understand to be suggested by the Bugle. To our minds, "the wise conclusion" of Mr. Wise, as a friend of Slavery, suggests a wiser motto for the friends of Liberty,—"on *this* wise."

"Slavery *shall* be abolished. The Union shall *not* be dissolved." To *abolish* Slavery, the Union is indispensable. The Constitution is our chief instrument.

In which of the slave States are the friends of liberty sufficiently powerful to abolish Slavery without help from the free states? Though they may be a majority, they are in an abject condition.

Ask the slaves, and the most intelligent colored people, whether they need no external aid, before you counsel a separation of their friends from them.

The Anti-Slavery Bugle, if we understand it, is in favor of dissolving the Union because Mr. Wise is in favor of *not* dissolving it. And it is in favor of throwing away the Constitution because Mr. Wise is in favor of retaining it. It suggests, at least, that the policy of the friends of liberty, in these respects, ought to be opposite, of course, to the policy of the friends of slavery. This argument we see, very frequently, employed.

Will the Bugle carry out this policy of contrariety, at all et us see.

Mr. Wise is against restoring the Missouri Compromise. Is the Bugle, therefore, in favor of restoring it? No. We are sure it is not; though many of our Free Republicans seem to make use of that logic. In answer to such logic, from that quarter, the Bugle would very naturally say, "No! We have no idea of doing such a thing, any more than we have of throwing away pen, press and types, because Mr. Wise and the slaveholders make use of them.—While they are against restoring the Missouri Compromise, because they mean to introduce slavery at the North, we are against restoring it, because we mean to introduce liberty into the South."

Thus far, the Bugle would reason as we do. Let it go farther, in the same direction, and say, "As it is the wisdom of Mr. Wise and the friends of slavery to claim and wield the Constitution and the Uuion for the *support* of slavery, so it is the wisdom of the friends of liberty to claim and wield them for its *overthrow.*"

Undoubtedly this is the dictate of true wisdom, the proper antithesis to the wisdom of Mr. Wise, if the Constitution, rightly construed, is against slavery, and if a majority of the people of the Union, being non-slaveholders, can be made to see and feel that interest as well as duty, requires them to use the ballot-box against slavery. [If this cannot be done, there is little hope of persuading them to dissolve the Union in order to cut loose from slavery.]

And if this be not so, we confess we can see no prospect of a peaceful abolition of slavery. In which of the British West India islands would slavery have been abolished, without the intervention of the British nation? In which of *our* slave states, is there a prospect of abolition without a national intervention?

We venture to predict that the final decision of the slavery question in America, will be made, not by the states acting separately, but *by the Nation.* So long as *the Nation* continues to pervert the Constitution and the Union for the support of slavery, it will continue.—Whenever *the Nation*, by the legitimate use of the Constitution, abolishes slavery, it will be abolished.

Neither the *friends* nor the *opponents* of slavery can afford to give up the use of the National arm, the National power, the National Constitution, the National Union, in the prosecution of this struggle, which is, in its own nature, a national struggle. Neither of them, unless strangely bewildered, will do it. The Letter of Mr. Wise assures us that the slaveholders will not. It equally assures us that the friends of liberty, if equally "wise in their generation," will not.

No. There is no prospect of a dissolution of the Union, on account of the slave question.—The slaveholders, notwithstanding their threats, are too "wise" to attempt it. The non-slaveholders have no occasion to dissolve the Union, on account of slavery. Whenever they care enough about the abolition of slavery to vote for its abolition, they will abolish it by their votes. There is, then, to be no dissolution of the Union. There are huge and enduring obstacles to it, both physical and metaphysical.—

The Alleghanies and the Mississippi have put their veto upon it, and so have the education and the spirit of the American people. National politics are the National passion. The highest ambition of State politics is, to mould the politics of the Nation. Even the New Englander is lost in the American. Abolitionism presents no exception to the rule. Its object is pre-eminently national. It leans forward to reach a *National decision.* That decision will be reached. The only question is, *What shall the National decision be?*

MINNESOTA.—The Republicans of Hennepen county, at their late Convention in Minneopolis adopted resolutions harmonizing with those of the late Convention of "Radical Political Abolitonists" at Syracuse. Vide the Minnesota Republican, Sept. 6th.

IGNORANCE OF AN EX-GOVERNOR.

Ex-Governor Seymour, in his speech in Tammany Hall, (as reported by his friends) said a good many foolish things. Among other things, he claimed that his "Democratic party," true to its principles of democracy, was opposed to the liquor prohibition law, and to the schemes of abolitionists, because both those "fanaticisms" had their rise in the old distrust, manifested at the first establishment of our institutions, of the capabilities of the people for *self-government!*

And so the democratic principle of "self-government" favors *enslavement,* does it? What then becomes of the right of "self-government" in the slaves?

Gov. Seymour doubtless had in mind the supposed right of each *community,* (a slave State, for example) to govern itself without interference, even when the said community strikes down the *individual* right of "self-government"! A beautiful democracy, this!

But let us see how his own doctrine works in his own case. His doctrine makes the right of the "community" every thing—the right of the individual, nothing. Very well. The community, in the exercise of the "capabilities of the people for self-government," enacts the prohibitory liquor law. All right, of course, if the "community" says so, and the individual liquor dealer has no cause to complain! But *this* is the height of despotism, in the eyes of Governor Seymour, as appears in this same speech!

Now, look at the logic of Gov. Seymour for one moment. The "community" has a right to *protect* the practice of brutalizing human beings, as is done by the slaveholders. This is only a legitimate exercise of "the capabilities of the people for self-government"! But the "community" has no right to *forbid* the embrutting of its citizens, by the liquor traffic. "The capabilities of the people for self government" forbid this! In the former case, all human rights inhere in the "community" of enslavers, leaving none for the individuals enslaved. In the latter case, all human rights inhere in the rum-seller, leaving none for the community who seek self-protection.

Which way would Governor Seymour have it? Is it the "community" or is it the individual whose "capabilities for self-government" are to be exclusively recognized?

If abolitionists are at fault in this matter, then all who would have *any* laws for restraining or forbidding *any* aggressions upon human rights and liberties are in the same fault. If slaveholders and rum-sellers may imbrute their victims with impunity, on the plea of relying on "the capability of the people for self-government," then the burglar, the horse-thief and the pirate may claim equal impunity, and for the same reason. And so we come to the end of civil law, and might as well disband civil government.

It is time to disentangle these sophistries.—Their absurdity is sufficiently apparent. But it is easier sometimes to expose an *error* than it is to exhibit the opposite *truth.* In this case, the needed truth is to be found only by a study of the foundation principles of civil government and civil law.

Government is for the administration of law. Law is for the protection of rights. Rights are the opposites of wrongs. And consequently, law is for the *suppression* of wrongs.

The right of the people to self-government is not the right of inflicting or of permitting wrongs committed against the equal rights of others. The rights of self-government in individuals and in communities are thus harmonized. The individual may not oppose self-government by the community. The community may not infringe the right of self-government in the individual, nor permit it to be infringed.

No right of self-government, therefore, is invaded, by the suppression of slaveholding and rum-selling. Self-government, in the individual, requires the former. Self-government in the community demands the latter. It is Gov. Seymour himself—not the prohibitionist nor the abolitionist—that denies the right of the people—individually and socially,—to "self-government." Self-government, individually, is denied by opposing the suppression of slavery. Self-government is denied to social humanity, when the community is denied the right of self-protection from rum-sellers.

So that the entire theory, principle, and practice of a virtuous democracy are denied by the argument of Gov. Seymonr; which ignores the true right of "self-government," both to the associated people, and to the individual man. The ascendancy of *such* a spurious democracy would enthrone despotism and abrogate law.

We add, that "the capability of the people for self-government" carries with it the double duty of *exercising* "self-government," and of *protecting* "self-government." And no people who discharge their duties will tolerate either rum-selling or slaveholding. To fail of suppressing them is to abandon "self-government" and submit to the misrule and the miseries of Slavery and Rum.

How lamentable and yet how ludicrous is the position of an Ex-Governor of a great State, whose ignorance of the first principles of civil government and civil law, which a child in a Sabbath school ought to understand, betrays him into such blunders! In the name of democracy he denies its first axioms. He complains of the people that they have no faith in "the capabilities of the people for self-government," because, in the exercise of these "capabilities," they have seen fit to enact wholesome laws for the protection of their own rights. He does this, after having, himself, as Governor, put his veto upon their exercise of "self-government," in the same matter. And then, in the same absurd style, he denounces as "fanaticism" the effort to protect the right of "self-government" in millions of "the people," who are totally robbed of that right. Can folly and "fanaticism" go further than this?

As a native citizen of the State of New York we blush at the discovery of such stolid stupidity within its borders. Had Horatio Seymour been a colored man, exhibiting such ignorance, the traducers of that race, who doubt their "capabilities of self-government," would have been, for the first time, furnished with a plausible argument. And yet this ignoramus has been our Governor! Shame!

MISCHIEVOUS ERRORS.

The following, from one of our exchanges, is a specimen of the Resolutions that have been generally adopted at Conventions of Free Republicans.

"Resolved, That we are opposed to the further extension of slavery, and are determined to exercise our political rights in opposition to its aggression to the extent of our constitutional power.

"Resolved, That slavery in the several States which recognize its existence depends upon State laws alone, for which the General Government, and we, as a portion of its constituents, are in no wise responsible, and we therefore propose no interference by Congress with slavery in any slave State, believing that the restriction of the political power of slavery in the government of the Union, is the best service we can legally and constitutionally render to the cause of universal emancipation."

Now, we submit, in the first place, that here are important mis-statements of facts.

1. Slavery *does not* exist by State laws; for there are no State laws establishing slavery, and the recognition of such a supposed fact is the recognition of a falsity.

2. The General Government *is* responsible for the slavery it fails to suppress, and which, by that very delinquency, it effectually protects.

3. The people of the United States *are* responsible for the slavery existing in the United States. God holds them responsible, and no form of government in the power of man or angel to devise, can relieve them of that responsibility, for nations are, of necessity, responsible for national sins, which they fail to remove. Were it true (as it is not) that the National Government has no Constitutional power to abolish slavery, that fact would only prove that the Nation and its Constitution were at variance with God's irrepealable Constitution of Civil Government.

These are errors respecting *facts.* And they are connected with and involve grave errors in political ethics.

The people of America have no moral right, and consequently they have no political right, to "propose no interference by Congress with slavery in any slave State." Congress, as the representative of the people, is bound to interfere, because the people are bound to interfere. The Constitution itself, binds Congress to interfere. "The United States SHALL guaranty,

to every State in this Union, a Republican form of Government." And Congress is bound to carry out the declared object of the Constitution—"to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty."

Thus do errors in morals grow out of errors respecting facts. And political errors grow out of both.

We know of no errors more destructive of political morality, or more dangerous to the liberties of the people, than those which we have here pointed out.

SCRAPS OF CORRESPONDENCE.

From a gentleman in Vermont.

A "SOBER SECOND THOUGHT."—Allow me to say that your views, as brought out in the first number of the Radical Abolitionist, seemed to me, at first, altogether impracticable and visionary. But the reading of the second number, and a little reflection have about convinced me that you are in the right track. If the people of the North can once be convinced that they are not bound to recognise the legality of slavery at the South, a great point will be gained. And this, I think, can be done. There are but few men who can take in all your views at once. But I doubt not, many, if their attention could be enlisted, might be induced to take this first step. Perhaps my policy is not the best, but I incline to go one step at a time. I will go as far as I can to-day, and let to-morrow take thought for the things of itself. What I will do to-morrow I can tell better when to-morrow comes."

From another Vermonter.

ENCOURAGEMENT AMID OBSTACLES.—"There is great encouragement for you and your coadjutors to labor; public sentiment is rising. It seems necessary to perform something like a surgical operation to get the truth through the hair of the great mass of men—much more their brains, saying nothing of the heart."

From Pennsylvania.

"RADICALISM."—"I am pleased with the new title of your paper. It is quite distinctive, and sufficiently significant to be understood. Webster's definition of "radical," "radicalism," together with brother John's idea of reform, accompanied with your comments, are well timed, and just what was needed."

From Alleghany Co., N. Y.

LECTURERS WANTED.—"I wish your Committee would send some one to lecture in this region, on the subject. I think one could do much good, in this direction. [We have similer applications from various places. Where are the men? and the means of sustaining them? ED.]

From Trumbull Co., O.

A NOBLE ENTERPRISE.—"I wish you to put down my name for ——. If I live, I will try to double it next year. I wish great success to this noble enterprise."

From Sandusky Co., O.

PROFITABLE INVESTMENTS.—"I have been in the habit, for a few years, of trying to exert some influence on those immediately around me, by circulating cheap publications and a few books, and I have not found an instance where an individual could be induced to read, that they remained long a supporter of slavery."

From Northern New York.

"IT MUST COME TO THAT."—"I heartily endorse the principles adopted by the Convention at Syracuse, although it is strong ground. It must come to that. The more those principles are reflected upon by candid men of all parties, the more they will be cherished, and will ultimately triumph."

"JUBILEE" SUBSCRIBERS.—We continue to send the "Radical Abolitionist" to the subscribers to the late "American Jubilee"—of which it is in fact a continuation, only by the Committee, instead of the Editor, and under another name. Very few of our old subscribers have discontinued. But a very considerable portion of them have not yet sent in the money for the present volume. Is it not time for them to do so? Our Committee are at large expense, in sending specimens to non-subscribers, and to those whom we hope to interest in our enterprise. But the funds for the outlay must be supplied by those who are already interested. They will, at least, remit the pay for their own papers, unless they are subscribers to the funds, in which case, the papers will be furnished them without additional charge.
